



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

how man is at his highest when he obeys the laws of nature, although civilization and Christianity alike call upon him to trample them under his feet.

#### FRUITS OF THE PRACTICE OF WAR.

If we wish to see the fruits of the actual practice of war in individual cases, we have only to go back to that of the Transvaal. Who is there who has not known how campaigning life has ruined the prospects of vast numbers of young and middle-aged men? They have returned home with the ability for steady regular work gone. They can give a brief space of time to it, but then the regularity becomes unbearable, and they throw up their work. And again, the methods of our warfare have either disgusted or they have hardened the men who had to take part in it. How the wickedness of the wholesale devastation of great countries, often indulged in simply to take away the possibility of existence from absolutely innocent people, people who were truly non-combatants, the horrors of the concentration camps thus rendered essential, the destruction of vast quantities of food so as to bring the lever of the starvation of the women and children to bear upon the men fighting for their fatherland, confounded every sense of right or wrong; how the one duty to kill became greater than all the early teaching of the Bible, than the Golden Rule or the Ten Commandments, and how we are learning every day, by constantly increasing deeds of violence, the evil influence of inculcating contempt for human life.

#### REAL REASON OF THE MOVEMENT.

How comes it that in this country, "this little isle set in the silver sea," there is so strong a movement in favor of militarism, of great defensive military preparations? For those living on the continent of Europe the possibility of invasion is constantly before them. They are divided from their neighbors by slight, often imaginary, boundaries. There are old traditions of quarrels, of invasions, of rectification or alteration of boundaries. Here these do not exist, but the invasion bogey does. I have pointed out one chief reason, that we have given undue weight to the words of those who are, ingrainedly and before all, fighting men. But we have sinned ourselves so greatly in the matters of land grabbing, land hunger, expansion of Empire; we have fought or rather massacred so many weaker people in the process of possessing ourselves of their land; we have so constantly exalted might at the expense of right,—that when two small peoples checked us for three years in the most iniquitous expansion of all, we got a severe shock. We found that others could be as brave and much abler in the exercise of their bravery than we could. We found how we could only hold our own by adopting the most barbarous and uncivilized tactics; that just as the annual cost of our army was out of all proportion to its size, so the exceptional expense of carrying on even so small a war was enormous. We learned that our methods and preparations were so miserable that they invited reckless extravagance, shameful waste, and extraordinary maladministration. Then we got frightened and, at the precise moment, up sprang the military preachers and declared that without universal military training we were in "a parlous state." No arguments were needed, no facts had to be adduced, the frequent repetition of the parrot cry "universal voluntary training or conscription" was enough.

I do not think that this wild preaching has got such

hold of the working men as of other classes, but they have not yet fully realised that upon them the great bulk of the burden will fall, for it is their children who are to be compelled to learn to do the fighting, to be the rank and file, not officers! They do not seem to have realized that it means little to the rich, less to the foreign parasites who fatten on our body politic. They have apparently not learned the lessons which the Transvaal War teaches. They did the fighting, they pay the bulk of the cost in taxes, and if the demand of moneyed men for Protection be listened to they will have to pay yet more for that direct result of the war. There was no glory for them to get out of such wars, if glory from war is ever worth having. Its creator has got a sadly bedraggled feather in his cap. The foreign millionaires have got and are getting the gold, though our brave British soldiers won it for them by their blood. But, indeed, for the moment, as a people, we have bowed down and worshipped Imperialism with its twin children, Materialism and Militarism, and we find now how far such gods are to be trusted — Materialism destroying all high and noble ideals and beliefs; Militarism ever ready to do the worst behests of those who take the poor materialistic view that money is the principal thing, whilst lives of men, honor, justice, truth, are mere idle words; and Imperialism, which means, and has always meant, the exaltation of force, the grinding of the weak and poor, the prosperity of the few and the poverty and degradation of the many. May the spirit of Peace enlighten the people of our islands whilst there is yet time!

BENSHAM GROVE, GATESHEAD, ENGLAND,  
DECEMBER, 1905.

### Brotherhood Between Races and Nations.

*From a Sermon Preached in Toronto, December 24, 1905.*

BY REV. J. T. SUNDERLAND, D. D.

In speaking of brotherhood between races, it is to be observed that progress is perhaps slower here than anywhere else, because the difficulties to be overcome are greatest. The first condition of friendship, or of any feeling that is akin to brotherhood, is acquaintance. People who are strange to us, whose ways are different from our ways, naturally repel us. Charles Lamb, in talking with a friend, referred to a certain man as one whom he hated. "But why do you hate him?" said his friend. "Do you know him?" "Oh, no," replied Lamb, "that is why I hate him." It is because races are usually so widely separated from one another — both in habitat and in race characteristics, as color, form, features, language, mode of dress and manner of living, and therefore strangers to each other — that there is so much race antagonism.

But this antagonism need not be permanent. Knowledge is fast increasing. All parts of the world and all races of men are being brought into closer touch with one another. There is no reason for the continuance of old ignorances, old prejudices, old feuds, old hatreds, old antagonisms. Intimate acquaintance with races shows them all to possess qualities which, in their different ways, are interesting and attractive, and which form a solid basis for mutual friendship, regard and fraternal relations. Indeed, rightly looked at, difference itself has

in it an element of charm. How much more interesting is the world because there is on its surface a variety of trees, a variety of flowers, a variety of animal life, a variety of scenery! In the same way, how much more interesting is humanity because there is a variety of races as well as of individuals!

I think there is no greater mistake than that of depreciating differences in races, in languages, in civilizations, in the dress and habits and characteristics of peoples, and wanting to reduce all to uniformity. Uniformity means monotony and poverty. Variety means interest, charm, intellectual and moral wealth. Friendship need not be confined to those of our own class, our own station in life, our own vocation, or even to our own race. Some of the warmest and truest friendships ever known have been between men of widely different races. Think of the friendships formed between Livingstone and the natives of Central Africa, among whom he lived and labored. Hundreds of those uncultured but simple-minded and true-hearted people he loved as his own children; and they on their part loved him as a father, and were eager to live and if need were to die for him. Any man greatly narrows and impoverishes his life who does not have friends—dear and prized friends—far removed from his own class. We should all learn to care for human beings as human beings, without reference to the accidents that differentiate them. Brotherhood should be as wide as humanity.

As a rule antagonism between races has largely come from the tendency on the part of the stronger and the more advanced races to tyrannize over, oppress and wrong the weaker and the less advanced—to subjugate them, to exploit their lands, and in many cases to make slaves of them. Of course there could be no brotherhood under such conditions. Brotherhood must be based upon justice. The thought of the strong and civilized powers of Europe concerning the weaker and less civilized peoples of Africa and Asia should be, not "How may we subjugate them, and gain possession of their territories, and exploit them for our own enrichment?" but "How may we help them, lift them up, set them on the road to higher civilization and self-development?"

What ought to be our attitude towards our Indians—that less civilized race within our national territory for whom we are responsible? It should be that of older brothers to younger. Our duty is not simply to pacify them and keep them from making trouble for us. Our duty is to take them by the hand, give them schools, but especially training in industries, agriculture, horticulture, stock-raising, dairying, trades and handicrafts, home-making—all those things which will help them to self-support and self-respect, and to become members of civilized communities.

What should be the attitude of the white people of the Southern States toward the negroes among them? That of older brothers to younger. Because the white people have always been free, while the negroes have been enslaved; because they have enjoyed advantages which the negroes have not; because their civilization is higher than that of the negroes,—therefore the greater responsibility is on them. *Noblesse oblige*. Position and privilege beget obligation. The higher race should be leaders in the work of lifting up the lower. Strong

men feel ashamed to abuse weak children. The races that are low down in civilization should be thought of as the child races of the world, to be protected and helped as children. If the negroes occasionally commit crimes against the whites, the white people should not reply by committing still greater crimes against them. Committing a second wrong never wipes out a first. The reply which the white people should make to the shortcomings of the negroes is, better schools and more of them, especially industrial and agricultural schools, like those at Hampton and Tuskegee. Grant that the race problem in the states is a very serious and difficult one: the key to it is brotherhood; there is no other. And brotherhood is the key to all the race problems, wherever they appear in the world.

If brotherhood is desirable between races, it is not less so between nations. Why is it that two men who are friends when standing together on one side of an imaginary line called a national boundary, should become enemies as soon as one of them steps to the other side of the line? What is there in nationality that should tend to destroy or limit human brotherhood? Why should we put into a flag a meaning which tends to stir up hostile feelings in our minds toward other nations, and to set us thinking not about friendly relations with them, but about guns and armies and fighting? If brotherhood of feeling is desirable between man and man, between family and family and between community and community, why is it not between state and state and nation and nation? Is it not just as important that Ontario and New York or Ontario and Michigan should be friendly as it is that Ontario and Quebec should be? Are not the people of New York and Michigan as good, as honorable, and withal as much like ourselves as the people of Quebec? Then, why not trust them as we trust Quebec, and cultivate the spirit of brotherhood toward them as we cultivate it toward our sister province?

It is very strange what uses we see men making of the word "patriotism." He who fights in some war that his country carries on, whether it is just or unjust, is called a patriot. He who devotes his whole life to his country in ways of peace, rendering her services of the greatest possible value, for example, as a teacher and educator of the young, or as an honorable and upright business man and developer of the country's financial and industrial resources, or as a just and incorruptible judge on the bench—such a man is seldom pointed to as a patriot. And yet which is the real patriot? In the long history of the relations between France and Germany, involving so many bloody struggles, those Frenchmen have always claimed to be most patriotic who have been the bitterest enemies of Germany and done the most to keep alive hostility between the two nations. And those Germans have always claimed to be most patriotic who have been the bitterest enemies of France and most fanned the flame of hatred toward France in the breasts of their countrymen. But it was always false patriotism. Such patriots, so called, were really enemies of their respective countries. The real friends of France and Germany—the men in those nations who have been real patriots—have been those who have labored to allay enmity, and to create between the two nations sentiments of goodwill and mutual respect and fraternity. So everywhere.

To-day are there any such enemies of England as those men who stir up in the public mind of Britain constant distrust of the nations of the continent, and thus push on the government to the building of more and ever more warships, with the money so deeply needed for feeding and clothing and housing and educating the people? The reason why a nation like England or Germany or France is in danger of having other nations fly at its throat, if any such danger exists, is because those other nations believe that it is ready, when a pretext arises, to fly at their throats. As there is no course so safe for an individual man as to behave himself and trust his fellows, so there is no course so safe for a nation as to behave itself and trust other nations. And as there is no course so dangerous for a man as to distrust everybody and go about arrogant and defiant and armed to the teeth, so no course is so dangerous for a nation as to distrust and antagonize other nations and depend for safety on armies and navies. The nation that is all the while looking for war and preparing for war will never be long without war, as the histories of all the leading military nations of the world show; while the nation that sincerely seeks peace will readily find it.

I do not believe there is a nation in Europe or America — at least a nation of any considerable size and importance — that could not with absolute safety to-morrow announce to the world: "From this time on we shall keep no army except simply enough for police purposes at home, and no navy except what may be necessary for police purposes on waters for which we are responsible; our policy hereafter will be peace; we shall commit no aggression; we shall try to treat all nations and all men justly and fairly; we shall cultivate among our own people a spirit of respect for other peoples; we shall do what in us lies to promote goodwill and brotherhood among all nations. If ever trouble arises between us and any other nation which we cannot peacefully settle between that nation and ourselves, we will submit it for settlement to the Hague Court, and abide by its decision." I say, I believe there is not an important nation of Europe or America that could not make such announcement as this to-morrow with perfect safety. Its security would be not simply as great as before, but very much greater. No nation would dare to attack it. No nation would wish to attack it. And how such a nation thus relieved from the staggering burden of modern militarism would forge ahead, in industries, in commerce, in the arts and sciences, in education, in the comfort and prosperity of its people! It would become the admired and the envied land of the whole civilized world.

And, believe me, one strong, influential nation, like France, or Germany, or Russia, or Great Britain, or the United States, or Canada, courageous enough and wise enough and foreseeing enough to take such a stand, would not long stand alone. Others would join her; others would be only too glad to join her when she led the way; nay, others would be compelled to join her or be left hopelessly behind in the race for prosperity, wealth, influence and leadership in the world. No! the nations of the world would need nothing else so much both for their prosperity and their safety as they need brotherhood.

We may fondly hope that the era of Alexander, Cæsar and Napoleon has passed, never to return. — *John W. Foster.*

## The Strengthening of Article 8 of the Hague Convention.

A writer in the January number of the *International Journal of Ethics*, Mr. Waldo L. Cook of Springfield, Mass., makes a strong plea for the strengthening of Article 8 of the Hague Convention, "as the most likely method of securing a practical advance toward making wars less frequent in the immediate future." After discussing the failure of the Hague Convention to prevent the war between Russia and Japan, Mr. Cook cites the five wars of the past decade as giving, in his view, a gloomy outlook for the triumph of international peace. He contends that the manner in which the Russo-Japanese hostilities broke out, without a declaration of war, show that "international war at this point has certainly degenerated," and that Articles 2 and 3 of the Hague Convention (providing for the offer of good offices or mediation by neutral powers) have proved themselves inefficient in insuring a hiatus, for passion to cool down, between a diplomatic rupture and resort to arms. We quote, somewhat condensed, the passages of the article in which he urges the strengthening of Article 8 (providing a form of special mediation) from the voluntary into the mandatory form:

"The failure of this article\* to make itself felt in the ante-bellum period of the recent war was no less complete than that of the other articles referred to. It might as well have been employed to prevent the Chicago fire as to prevent the far eastern conflict. Yet this is the article which seems to afford the most hope for a practical advance toward making wars less frequent in the immediate future. Obviously, it was ignored by the governments at Tokio and St. Petersburg because they were not in the least bound by its terms. The general method suggested for delaying a military collision which may appear imminent is excellent; but the recent experience demonstrated that it will never come into use by great powers on the verge of war so long as its application is merely 'recommended,' 'when circumstances allow,' to governments at variance. But if this method of conciliation could be made a solemn *obligation*, resting upon every signatory of the Hague Treaty, the good it would do might be beyond one's power to estimate. With a hiatus of even thirty days between a diplomatic rupture and a resort to arms, imposed by treaty upon possible or probable belligerents, during which period seconds should seek a basis for a friendly understanding, we could be indifferent whether or not the practice of sending formal ultimatums and making formal declarations of war disappeared from the customs of nations.

"The method of calling in seconds at a critical point in a controversy is drawn from the dueling code, but as

\*ART. 8. The signatory powers are agreed in recommending the application, when circumstances allow, of special mediation in the following form:

"In case of a serious difference endangering the peace, the states at variance shall each choose a power, to whom they intrust the mission of entering into direct communication with the power chosen on the other side, with the object of preventing the rupture of pacific relations.

"During the period of this mandate, the term of which, unless otherwise stipulated, cannot exceed thirty days, the states in conflict shall cease from all direct communication on the subject of the dispute, which is regarded as having been referred exclusively to the mediating powers, who shall use their best efforts to settle the controversy.

"In case of a definite rupture of pacific relations, these powers remain charged with the joint duty of taking advantage of every opportunity to restore peace."